



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,033	04/09/2001	Frank Venegas JR.	IDS-14302/14	8392
25006 7590 02/04/2010 GIFFORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C PO BOX 7021 TROY, MI 48007-7021				
EXAMINER SAWHNEY, HARGOBIND S				
ART UNIT 2885		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 02/04/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/829,033

Applicant(s)

VENEGAS, FRANK

Examiner

HARGOBIND S. SAWHNEY

Art Unit

2885

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-11 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on November 3, 2009 has been entered. Accordingly:
 - Claims 3-5 have been amended; and claim 2 has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,121,307 (Moore).

Regarding Claim 1, Moore discloses a lighted assembly 10 (Figure 4, column 2, line 18) further comprising:

- an elongated tubular body 11 having an open end 12, and a closed end 15 defining a cavity – enclosed by element 18 – (Figure 4);
- the open end 12 of the cavity receiving the stanchion 14 (Figures 1 and 4);
- a lighted assembly 10 (Figure 4, column 2, line 18) having a light source 17 (Figure 4, column 2, line 23) interconnected to a power source 22 (Figure 4, column 2, line 36);
- the light source 17 secured relative to the tubular body 11, and making its light visible exteriorly of the interior cavity (Figures 1 and 4; an elongated

- tubular body receiving the stanchion in its cavity; and
- the open end of the elongated tubular body proximate – interpreted with similar thinking as that included in the recitation- to the ground surface; and
- an external source of electrical energy 25 – solar based electrical power system- disposed outside the elongated tube 11 (Figure 1, column 2, lines 47-56).

However, Moore does not specifically teach the stanchion having its open end proximate to the ground.

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the lighted assembly of Moore by extending the length of the elongated tubular body, and accommodating entire stanchion with in itself, or making its open end contacting the ground, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in size of the component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claims 3-5, Moore discloses the lighting assembly additionally including:

- an electronic circuit (Moore, Figures 1, 3 and 4) managing and controlling power for the device; and
- the lighted assembly 10 further having a light source receptacle (not shown) receiving the lamp 17 (Moore, Figure 1); and
- the power source 25 including a plurality of photovoltaic devices 28 Figure

1, column 2, lines 47-56).

Regarding Claim 6, Moore discloses the lighting assembly including electrical storage batteries 22 positioned within the stanchion sleeve – the tubular body- instead of that positioned outside the sleeve.

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the lighted assembly of Moore by positioning the batteries outside the sleeve by mechanically coupling them to the solar panel assembly, since it has been held that rearranging parts of a prior art structure involves only routing skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950). Further, positioning of the batteries external to the sleeve would promote cost effective maintenance and replacement.

4. Claims 7, 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore (U.S. Patent No. 5,121,307) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,204,777 (Lyons).

Regarding claims 7, 10 and 11, Moore discloses a lighted assembly including the light source secured relative to the tubular body, and making its light visible exteriorly of the interior cavity.

However, Moore does not teach the elongated tubular body displaying a massage illuminated with light emitting diodes LEDs.

On the other hand, Lyons discloses an illuminated sign assembly 10 mounted on a post 16, and displaying a massage 38 illuminated with light emitting diodes LEDs 18 (Figures 2 and 4, column 2, lines 34-44; and column 3, lines 16-25).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the lighted assembly of Moore by providing stenciled message sign on the post as taught by Lyons for the benefit and advantage of cost-effective display messages having high attention value.

Regarding claim 8, Moore in view of Lyons discloses a lighted assembly including a message 38 as applied to claim 7 discussed above.

However, neither in combination nor Moore and Lyons teaches the elongated tubular body displaying a message being stenciled letters or message.

The limitation "the message is stenciled letters" is the product-by- process" limitation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to message including stenciled letters, since it has been held by the courts that patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is disclosed, or suggested, by the Prior Art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore (U.S. Patent No. 5,121,307) in view of Japanese Pattern No. JP 08239812 A (Kageyama et al.).

Regarding claim 9, Moore discloses a lighted assembly including the light source secured relative to the tubular body, and making its light visible exteriorly of the interior cavity.

However, Moore does not teach the elongated tubular body displaying least one light dispersing window.

On the other hand, Kageyama et al. discloses an illuminated sign assembly (Figure 1) mounted on a post 1, and displaying a message 15 including more than one light-dispersing windows (Kageyama et al. Figure 1. English translated abstract).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the lighted assembly of Moore by providing the light-dispersing windows as taught by Kageyama et al. for the benefit and advantage of cost-effective display messages having high attention value.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore (U.S. Patent No. 5,121,307) in view of US Patent 6,120,165 (Shalvi).

Regarding claim 9, Moore discloses a lighted assembly including the light source secured relative to the tubular body, and making its light visible exteriorly of the interior cavity.

However, Moore does not teach the elongated tubular body including a proximity detector and control electronics.

On the other hand, Shalvi discloses a solar-powered lighting assembly mounted on an elongated body 10 comprising a proximity detector 14 operatively connected to control electronics capable of activating the light emitting elements included in the diffusing elements 15 and 16 (Figure 1, column 1, lines 41-67).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the lighted assembly of Moore by providing the proximity detector as

taught by Shalvi for the benefits of alarming presence of an intruder.

Response to Amendment

7. Applicant's arguments filed on March 1, 2006 with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 1-11 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejections necessitated by the amendment.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claim 12 is allowed.

The prior art of record, including Moore (U.S. Patent No. 5,121,307), fails to show or suggest the applicant's invention as claimed. Specifically, the prior art of record does not disclose proper motivation for combining:

- the body of the cover having a second cavity defined by the inner and outer surfaces and the thickness; and
- the second cavity encapsulating a photo-luminescent mixture.

The above-indicated combination, including a body of a cover having a second cavity encapsulating a photo-luminescent mixture, makes this invention unique.

Therefore, Claim 12 is allowed over prior art.

Response to Amendment

9. Applicant's arguments filed on July 22, 2009 with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

rejections of claims 1-11 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejections necessitated by the amendment.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hargobind S Sawhney whose telephone number is 571 272 2380. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Jong-Suk (James) Lee can be reached on 571 272 7044. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

2/1/2010

/Hargobind S. Sawhney/
Primary Examiner; Art Unit 2885